

A N
A N S W E R

TO SOME
P A P E R S

Lately Printed, concerning the

A U T H O R I T Y

O F T H E

C A T H O L I C K C H U R C H

In MATTERS of FAITH, and the
R E F O R M A T I O N of the
C H U R C H of E N G L A N D.

[Edward Stillingfleet]

D U B L I N,

Reprinted by *Jos. Ray*, on *Colledge Green*, for *Rob Thornton*,
at the *Leather-Bottle* in *Skinner Row*. MDCLXXXVI.

A NEW

ANSWER

TO SOME

QUESTIONS

Proposed by

JOHN H. HAY

OF THE

UNITED STATES

SENATE

IN RESPONSE TO

A RESOLUTION

PASSED

APRIL 10, 1866

BY THE SENATE

OF THE UNITED STATES

IN RESPONSE TO

A N

ADVERTISEMENT.

I*F the Papers here answered, had not been so publicly dispersed through the Nation, a due Respect to the Name they bear, would have kept the Author from publishing any Answer to them. But because they may now fall into many hands, who without some assistance may not readily resolve some difficulties started by them, He thought it not unbecoming his duty to God and the King, to give a clearer light to the Things contained in them. And it can be no reflection on the Authority of a Prince, for a private Subject to examine a piece of Coyn as to its just value, though it bears His Image and Superscription upon it. In matters that concern Faith and Salvation, we must prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.*

A N.
A N S W E R
 TO THE
F I R S T P A P E R.

IF all men could *believe as they pleased*, I should not have fail'd of satisfaction in this *First Paper*, the Design of it being to put an end to *Particular Disputes*; to which I am so little a Friend, that I could have been glad to have found, as much reason in it to convince, as I saw there was a fair appearance to deceive. But there is a *Law in our Minds* distinct from that of our *Inclinations*; and out of a just and due regard to That, we must examine the most plausible Writings, tho' back'd with the greatest Authority, before we yield our Assent unto them.

If particular Controversies about *Matters of Faith* could be ended by a Principle, as visible as that the *Scripture is in Print*, all men of sense would soon give over Disputing; for none who dare believe what they see, can call that in Question. But what if the *Church*, whose Authority, it is said, they must submit to, will not allow them to believe what they see? How then can this be a sufficient reason to persuade them to believe the Church; because it is as visible as that the *Scripture is in Print*? Unless we must only use our senses to find out the Church, and renounce them as soon as we have done it. Which is a very bad requital of them, and no great Honour to the Church which requires it.

But with all due submission, it is no more visible that the *Roman Church* is the *Catholic Church*; than it is, that a part is the whole, and the most corrupt part, that one Church, which Christ bath here upon Earth.

It is agreed among all Christians. That Christ can have but one Church upon Earth, as there is but one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. And this is that Church we profess to believe in the two Creeds. But if those, who made those Creeds for our direction, had intended the *Roman Catholick Church*, why was it not so expressed? How came it to pass that such a limitation of the sense of Christs *Catholick Church* to the *Roman*, should never be put to Persons to be Baptized in any Age of the Church? For I do not find in the Office of Baptism, even in the *Roman Church*, that it is required, that they believe the *Roman Catholick Church*, or that they deny the validity of Baptism out of the Communion of the *Roman Church*. From whence it is to me as visible as that the Scripture is in Print, that the Church of Rome it self doth not believe that it is, the *one Catholick Church* mentioned in the two Creeds. For then it must void all Baptism out of its Communion, which it hath never yet done: And as long as Baptism doth enter Persons into the Catholick Church, it is impossible, that all who have the true form of Baptism, though out of the Communion of the *Roman Church*, should be Members of the *Catholick Church*, and yet the Communion of the *Roman* and *Catholick* be all one; as it must be if the *Roman Church*, be the *Catholick* and *Apostolick Church* profess'd in the Creeds.

If we had been so happy to have lived in those Blessed Times; when the multitudes of them that believed were of one heart, and of one soul; it had been no difficulty to have shew'd that one visible Church, which Christ had here upon Earth. But they must be great strangers to the History of the Church, who have not heard of the early and great Divisions in the Communion of it. And there was a remarkable difference in the Nature of those Schisms, which happened in the Church; which being not considered hath been the occasion of great misapplication of the sayings of the Ancients about the *One Catholick Church*. Some did so break off Communion with other parts of the *Catholick Church*, as to challenge that Title wholly to themselves; as was evident in the case of the *Novatians* and *Donatists*; for they rebaptiz'd all that embraced their Communion: Others were cast out of Communion upon particular differences; which were not supposed to be of such a nature, as to make them no members of the *Catholick Church*. So the Bishops of Rome excommunicated the Bishops of *Asia* for not keeping *Easter* when They did; and the Bishops both of *Asia* and *Africa*, for not allowing the Baptism of Hereticks. But is it reasonable to suppose, that upon these Differences they shut out all those Holy Bishops and Martyrs from the possibility of Salvation, by excluding them from their Communion? If not, then there may be different Communions among Christians, which may still continue Parts of the *Catholick Church*; and consequently no one Member of such a Division ought to assume

assume to it self the Title and Authority of the *One Catholick Church*. But if any *One* Paradox so, though never so great and conspicuous, it is guilty of the same Presumption with the *Novatians* and *Donatists*, and is as much cause of the Schisms, which happen thereupon in the Church, as they were.

For a long time before the Reformation, there had been great and considerable breaches, between the *Eastern* and *Western Churches*; inſomuch that they did renounce each others Communion. And in these Differences four *Patriarchal Churches* joined together against the fifth, viz. that of the Bishop of *Rome*. But the *Eastern Patriarchs* liking in their Power, by the horrible Invasioun of the Enemies of the Christian Faith; and the Bishops of *Rome* advancing themselves to so much Authority, by the advantages they took from the kindness of some Princes, and the *Weakness* of others, They would hear of no other terms of accommodation with the *Eastern Churches*, but by an intire submission to the *Pope as Head of the Catholick Church*. Which all the Churches of the East refused, however different among themselves; and to this day look on the *Pope's Supremacy* as an Innovation in the Church, and Usurpation on the Rights of the other Patriarchs and Bishops. In all those Churches the *Two Creeds* are professed, true Baptism administered, and an undoubted Succession of Bishops from the Apostles; How then come They to be excluded from being *Parts* of the *One Catholick and Apostolick Church*? And if they be not excluded, how can the *Roman Church* assume to it self that glorious Title: So that it seems to me as visible as that the *Scripture is in Print*, that the *Roman Church* neither is, nor can be that *One Church*, which Christ left upon Earth.

And this Principle being removed (which ought to be taken for granted; since it can never be proved) we must unavoidably enter into the Ocean of *Particular Disputes*. And I know no reason any can have to be so afraid of it, since we have so sure a Compass, as the Holy Scripture to direct our passage. But the reason of avoiding *particular Disputes* is, because the evidence is too clear in them, that the *Church of Rome* hath notoriously deviated from this infallible Rule. And it is as impossible for a Church, which hath erred, to be Infallible, as for a Church really Infallible, to err. But if a Church pretend to prove her Infallibility by Texts, which are not so clear, as those which prove her to have actually erred; then we have greater reason to recede from her Errors, than to be deceived with such a fallible pretence to Infallibility.

Well! But it is not left to every phantastical mans head to believe as he pleases, but to the Church.

And is it indeed left to the Church to believe as it pleases? But the meaning I suppose is, that those, who reject the Authority of the Roman Catholick Church, do leave every man to believe according to his own fancy. Certainly those of the Church of England, cannot be liable to any imputation of this Nature. For our Church receives the three Creeds, and embraces the four General Councils, and professes to hold nothing contrary to any Universal Tradition of the Church from the Apostles times. And we have often offered to put the Controversies between Us, and the Church of Rome upon that issue. And do not those rather believe as they please, who believe the Roman Church to be the Catholick Church, without any colour from Scriptures, Antiquity or Reason? Do not those believe as they please, who can believe against the most convincing evidence of their own senses? Do not those believe as they please, who can reconcile the lawfulness of the Worship of Images, with Gods forbidding it, the Communion in one kind, with Christs Institution, and the praying in an unknown Tongue with the 14. Ch. of the first Epistle to the Corinthians?

But all these and many other Absurdities may go down by vertue of the Churches Authority, to whom, it is said, Christ left the Power upon Earth to govern us in matters of Faith. We do not deny that the Church hath Authority of declaring matters of Faith, or else it never could have condemn'd the Antient Heresies. But then we must consider the difference between the Universal Church in a General and free Council, declaring the sense of Scripture in Articles of Faith, generally received in the Christian Church from the Apostles Times, as was done when the Nicene Creed was made; and a Faction in the Church assuming to it self the Title of Catholick, and proceeding by other rules, than the first Councils did, and imposing new Opinions and Practices, as things necessary to the Communion of the Catholick Church. And this is the true Point in difference between us, and those of the Roman Church about the Churches Authority in matters of Faith, since the Council of Trent. For we think we have very great reason to complain, when a Party in the Church, the most corrupt and obnoxious, takes upon it self to define many new Doctrines, as necessary Points of Faith, which have neither Scripture, nor Universal Tradition for them.

It were a very irrational thing, we are told, to make Laws for a Country, and leave it to the Inhabitants to be Interpreters and Judges of those Laws; for then every Man will be his own Judge, and by consequence no such thing, as either Right or Wrong.

But is it not as irrational to allow an *Ursurper* to interpret the *Laws* to his own advantage, against the just Title of the Prince, and the true Interest of the People? And if it be not Reasonable for any private Person to be *his own Judge*, why should a publick Invader be so? But we hope it will be allowed to the Loyal Inhabitants of a Country, so far to interpret the *Laws*, as to be able to understand the Duty they owe to their King, and to justify his Right against all the Pretences of *Ursurpers*. And this is as much as we plead for in this case.

Can we therefore suppose, That God Almighty would leave us at those uncertainties, as to give us a Rule to go by, and leave every Man to be his own Judge?

And can we reasonably suppose, That God Almighty should give us a Rule not capable of being understood by those to whom it was given, in order to the great End of it, *viz.* the saving of their Souls? For this was the main end of the Rule, to direct us in the way to Heaven, and not merely to determine Controversies. The Staff, which a Man uses, may serve to measure things by, but the principal design is to walk with it. So it is with the Holy Scripture, if Controversies arise: It is fit to examine and compare them with this Infalible Rule; but when that is done, to help us in our way to Heaven is that which it was chiefly intended for. And no Man can think it of equal consequence to him, not to be mistaken, and not to be damned. In matters of Good and Evil, every mans Conscience is his immediate judge, and why not in matters of Truth and Falshood? Unless we suppose mens involuntary mistakes to be more dangerous than their wilful sins.

But after all, *We do not leave every Man to be his own Judge*, any further than it concerns his own Salvation, which depends upon his particular Care and Sincerity. For to prevent any dangerous Mistakes by the Artifice of Seducers, we do allow the Assistance of those Spiritual Guides, which God hath appointed in his Church, for the better instructing and governing private Persons: We embrace the Ancient Creeds, as a summary comprehension of the Articles of Faith; and think no Man ought to follow his own particular Fancy against Doctrines so universally received in the Christian Church, from the Apostles Times.

I do ask any Ingenious Man, whether it be not the same thing to follow our own Fancy, or to interpret Scripture by it.

If we allowed no Creeds, no Fathers, no Councils, there might have been some colour for such a Question. But do we permit Men to interpret Scripture according to their own Fancy, who live in a Church, which owns the Doctrine of the Primitive Church more frankly and ingenuously, than any Church in the World besides, without setting up any private Spirit against it, or the present Roman Church to be the Interpreter of it. And now I hope I may have leave to ask some Questions of any ingenious Man; as, whether it be not the same thing for the Church of Rome to make the Rule, as to assume to it self the sole Power of giving the sense of it? For what can a Rule signify without the sense? And if this were the intention of Almighty God, had it not been as necessary to have told us, to whom he had given the Power of Interpreting the Rule, as to have given the Rule it self? Whether it be reasonable for the Church of Rome, to interpret those Texts, wherein this Power of Interpreting, is to be contained? For this is to make it Judge in its own Cause, which was thought an Absurdity before. And whether it be not as mischievous to allow a Prosperous Usurper the Power of Interpreting Laws, according to his own Interest, as any private Person, according to his own Fancy? Whether it be possible to reform Disorders in the Church, when the Person principally accused is Supreme Judge? Whether those can be indifferent Judges in Councils, who beforehand take an Oath, to defend that Authority which is to be Debated? Whether Tradition be not as uncertain a Rule, as Fancy, when Men judge of Tradition according to their Fancy?

I would have any Man shew me, where the Power of deciding matters of Faith is given to every particular Man.

If by deciding Matters of Faith be understood the determining them in such a manner, as to oblige others, I do not know where it is given to every particular Man, nor how it should be. For then every particular Man would have a Power over every particular Man; and there would want a new Decision, whose should take place. But if by deciding Matters of Faith, no more be meant, but every mans being satisfied of the Reasons, why he believes one thing to be true, and not another; that belongs to every Man, as he is bound to take care of his Soul, and must give an account both to God and Man of the Reason of his Faith. And what can be meant in Scripture by Proving all things, and holding fast that which is good, 1 Thess. 5. 21. By trying the Spirits, whether they be of God, 1 John 4. 1.

By

By judging of themselves what is right. Luke 12. 57. unless God had given to Mankind a Faculty of discerning truth and falshood in Matters of Faith. But if every Man hath not such a Power, how comes he to be satisfied about the Churches Authority? Is not that a Matter of Faith? And where ever any Person will shew me, that every Man hath a Power to determine his Faith in that matter, I'll undertake to shew him the rest.

Christ left his Power to his Church, even to forgive Sins in Heaven, and left his Spirit with them, which they exercised after his Resurrection.

But where then was the *Roman Catholick Church*? And how can it be hence inferred, That these Powers are now in the Church of *Rome*, exclusive to all others, unless it be made appear that it was *Heir-General* to all the *Apostles*? I suppose it will be granted, that the *Apostles* had some gifts of the Spirit, which the Church of *Rome* will not in Modesty pretend to; such as the Gift of Tongues, the Spirit of Discerning, Prophecie, Miraculous Cures and Punishments. Now, here lies the difficulty, to shew what part of the Promise of the Infallible Spirit (for the ordinary Power of the Keys relates not to this matter) was to expire with the *Apostles*, and what was to be continued to the Church in all Ages. A Promise of Divine Assistance is denied by none but *Pelagians*: But how far that extends, is the Question. In the Souls of good Men it is so as to keep them in the way to Heaven, but not to prevent any lapse into sin; and it were worth our knowing, where God hath ever promised to keep any Men more from Error, than from Sin. Doth he hate one more than the other? Is one more disagreeing to the Christian Doctrine than the other? How came then so much to be said for the keeping Men from Error, when at the same time, they confess they may not only commit great sins, but err very dangerously in the most Solemn manner, in what relates to the Doctrine of Manners. Would any have believed the *Apostles* Infallible, if they had known them to be Persons of ill Lives; or that they had notoriously erred in some Rules of great Consequence to the Welfare of Mankind? Now, all this is freely yielded, as to the Pretence of Infallibility in the Church of *Rome*. It is granted, that the Guides of that Church have been very bad Men; and that in Councils they have frequently erred about the Deposing Power, being only a *Master of Practice*, and not of Faith. Whether it be so or not, I now dispute not; but it is granted, that notwithstanding this Infallible Spirit, the *Roman Church* may grossly err in a matter of mighty Consequence to the Peace of Christendom; and yet it cannot err in decreeing the least Matters of Faith. As for Instance, it can by no means err about the *seven Sacraments*, or the Intention of the Priest about them; but it may err about *Deposing Princes*, and *Absolving Sub-*

jells from their Allegiance: Which in easier terms is, They can never err about their own Interest, but they may about any other whatsoever.

I pass over the next Paragraph, the Sense being in perfect, and what is material about the Creeds, hath been spoken to already.

That which next deserves Consideration, is,

That the Church was the Judge even of the Scripture it self, many years after the Apostles, which Books were Canonical, and which were not.

We have a distinction among us of *Judges of the Law* and *Judges of the Fact*: The One declares what the *Law* is, the *Fact* being supposed; the Other gives judgment upon the *Fact*, as it appears before them. Now in this Case about the *Canonical Books*, the Church is not judge of the *Law*. For they are not to declare whether a Book appearing to be *Canonical* ought by it to be received for *Canonical*; (which is taken for granted among all Christians) but all they have to do, is to give judgment upon the Matter of *Fact*, *i. e.* whether it appear upon sufficient Evidence to have been a Book written by Divine Inspiration. And the *Church of Rome* hath no particular Privilege in this matter, but gives its Judgment as other parts of the Christian World do: And if it takes upon it to judge contrary to the general sense of the Christian Church, we are not to be concluded by it; but an Appeal lyes to a greater Tribunal of the Universal Church.

And if they had this Power, then I desire to know, how they came to lose it?

Who are meant by *They*? And what is understood by *this Power*? It is one thing for a Part of the Church to give Testimony to a matter of *Fact*, and another to assume the Power of making Books *Canonical*, which were not so. This latter no Church in the World hath, and therefore can never lose it: The former is only Matter of Testimony, and all parts of the Church are concerned in it, and it depends as other Matters of *Fact* do, on the Skill and Fidelity of the Reporters.

And by what Authority Men separate themselves from that Church?

What Church? The Catholick and Apostolick? We own no Separation from that; but we are disjoined from the Communion of the *Roman Church*, that we may keep up the stricter Union with the truly Catholick and Apostolick Church. And this is no *Separating our selves*, but being cast out by an Usurping Faction in the

the Church; because we would not submit to the unreasonable Conditions of Communion imposed by it; the chief whereof is owning all the Usurpation, which hath by degrees been brought into it. To make this plain by an Example: Suppose a prosperous Usurper in this Kingdom had gained a considerable Interest in it, and challenged a Title to the whole, and therefore required of all the Kings Subjects, within his Power, to own him to be Rightful King: Upon this, many of them are forced to withdraw, because they will not own his Title: Is this an act of Rebellion, and not rather of true Loyalty? Schism in the Church is like Rebellion in the State. The Pope declares himself Head of the Catholic Church, and hath formed himself a kind of Spiritual Kingdom in the West; although the other parts of the Christian World declare against it, as an Usurpation. However, he goes on; and makes the owning his Power a necessary Condition of being of his Communion. This many of the Western Parts, as well as Eastern, disown and reject, and therefore are excluded Communion with that Church, whereof he is owned to be the Head. The Question now is, Who gives the Occasion to this Separation? whether the Pope, by requiring the owning his Usurpation, or We, by declaring against it? Now, if the Conditions, he requires, be unjust and unreasonable; if his Authority, he challenges, over the Catholic Church, be a meer Usurpation (for which we have not only the Consent of the other Parts of the Christian World, but of Scripture and the Ancient Church) then we are not to be condemned, for such a Separation, which was unavoidable, if we would not comply with the Pope's Usurpation. And upon this Foot the Controversie about Schism stands between Us and the Church of Rome.

The only Pretence I ever heard of, was, because the Church hath fail'd in wresting and interpreting the Scripture contrary to the true sense and meaning of it; and that they have imposed Articles of Faith upon us, which are not to be warranted by Gods Word. I do desire to know who is to be Judge of that, whether the whole Church, the Succession whereof hath continued to this day without interruption; or particular Men, who have raised Schisms for their own advantage.

The whole force of this Paragraph depends upon a Supposition, which is taken for granted, but will never be yielded by Us, and we are sure can never be proved by those of the Church of Rome, viz. That in the new imposed Articles, the whole Church in a continued Succession hath been of the same judgment

judgment with them, and only some few Particular Men in these last Ages have opposed them. Whetsoever the great thing we insist upon next to the Holy Scripture, is, that they can never prove the Points in difference, by an Universal Tradition from the Apostles Times; either as to the *Papal Supremacy*, or the other Articles defined by the *Council of Trent*. We do not take upon our selves to contradict the Universal sense of the Christian Church from the Apostles Times in any one Point. But the true Reason of the proceeding of the *Church of England* was this. While the Popes Authority was here received and obeyed, there was no liberty of searching into abuses, or the ways of Reforming them. But when Men were encouraged to look into the Scripture, and Fathers, and Councils, they soon found the state of things in the Church extremely altered from what they ought to have been, or had been in the Primitive Church: But they saw no possibility of Redress, as long as the Popes Authority was so absolute and inviolable. This therefore in the first place they set themselves to the accurate Examination of, and the Result was, that they could find it neither in the Scriptures, nor Fathers, nor Councils, nor owned by the Eastern Churches: And therefore they concluded it ought to be laid aside, as an Usurpation. Our Church being by this means set free (even with the consent of Those, who joined with the Church of *Rome* in other things) a greater liberty was then used in examining particular Doctrines and Practices, which had crept into the Church by degrees, when Ignorance and Barbarism prevail'd; and having finish'd this enquiry, Articles of Religion were drawn up, wherein the sense of our Church was delivered, agreeable to Scripture and Antiquity, though different from the Modern Church of *Rome*; and these Articles are not the private sense of particular Men, but the Publick Standard whereby the World may judge, what we believe and practise; and therefore these are the sense of our Church, and not the opinions or fancies of particular Men. And those who call the retrenching the Popes exorbitant Power by the name of Schism, must by parity of reason call the casting off an Usurper Rebellion. But certainly those who consider the mighty advantages and priviledges of the *Clergy* in the Church of *Rome*, can never reasonably suspect any of that Order should hope to better themselves by the Reformation. And if we judge of Mens actions by their Interest, one of the most surprizing considerations at this day is, that the *Clergy* should be against, and *Princes* for the Church of *Rome*.

A N
A N S W E R
TO THE
S E C O N D P A P E R.

I *T is a sad thing to consider, what a world of Heresies are crept into this Nation.*

But is it not a strange thing to consider, that no distinction is here put between the Religion by Law established; and the Parties disowned by it, and dissenting from it? And yet many of these, though justly liable to the charge of *Schism*, embrace no Heresies against the Four or Six first General Councils. But if the Dissenters were guilty of never so many Heresies, how comes the Church of England to bear the blame of them; when the weakning its Power and Authority was the occasion of such an overflowing of *Schisms* and *Heresies* among us? And it is indeed a sad thing to consider how many Ways and Means have been used by all Parties to introduce and keep up *Schisms* and *Divisions* amongst us, and then how the Church of England is blamed for not being able to suppress them. But if all Doctrines opposite to the Church of Rome be accounted *Heresies*, then we desire to be informed, how the Church of Rome came to have this Power of defining Heretical Doctrines; or how any Doctrine comes to be *Heresie* by being contrary to its definitions. For *Heresie* is an obstinate opposing some necessary Article of Faith. It must therefore be proved, that what the Church of Rome declares, doth thereby become a necessary Article of Faith, or it is very unreasonable to lay the imputation of *Heresie* upon us. And this can never be maintained, without proving that the Church of Rome hath a Power to make Doctrines not necessary before, to become necessary by her Definition: which is the same thing with making

New

An Answer to the Second Paper.

New Articles of Faith. But these can never be proved to be such by Universal Tradition; which the Church of Rome pretends for all her Articles of Faith.

Every Man thinks himself as competent a Judge of Scripture, as the very Apostles themselves.

Doth *Every Man* among us pretend to an infallible Spirit? and yet *Every Man* owns that the Apostles had it. But what is meant by being a *Judge of Scripture*? It no more be understood, than that *every Man* must use his understanding about it, *tho' it is no Crime nor Heresy.* The Scripture must be believed in order to Salvation, and therefore it must be understood; for how can a Man believe, what he understands not the sense or meaning of? If he must understand the sense he must be *Judge of the sense*; so that *every Man*, who is bound to believe the Scripture in order to his Salvation, must be Judge of the sense of the Scripture, so far as concerns his Salvation. But if by being a *Judge of the Scripture* be meant giving such a judgment, as obliges others to submit to it, then among us no particular Man doth pretend to be a *competent Judge of Scripture*, so as to bind others to rely upon his Authority in expounding Scripture. We own the Authority of Guides in the Church, and a due submission to them, but we do not allow them to be as *competent Judges of Scripture as the very Apostles.*

And 'tis no wonder it should be so, since that part of the Nation, which looks most like a Church, dares not bring the true Arguments against the other Sects, for fear they should be turned against themselves, and confuted by their own Arguments.

This is directly lev'd against the Church of England, which is hereby charged with Insincerity or Weakness in dealing with the Dissenters. But we must consider the meaning of this Charge, *It is no wonder it should be so, i. e. That every Man should think himself as competent a Judge of Scripture, as the very Apostles, because the Church of England dares not use the true Arguments against the Sects.* Whence it appears that this true Argument is the Churches *infallible Authority*, and the Obligation of all Members of the Church to submit their judgments intirely thereto. I confess that if the Church of England did pretend to this against the *Sectaries*, they might justly turn it against her; because in our Articles, *tho' the Churches Authority be asserted, yet Infallibility is denied.* If there can be no Authority in a Church, without Infallibility; or there can be no obligation to submit to Authority, without it, then the Church of England doth not use the best Arguments against *Sectaries.* But if there be no ground for Infallibility, if the Church which has most pretended

pretended to it, hath been most grossly deceived, if the Heads of that Church have been not barely suspected of *Heresy*, but one of them stands condemned for it in Three General Councils, own'd by that Church; then for all that I can see, the Church of England hath wisely disowned the pretence of *Infallibility*, and made use of the best Arguments against *Seſtaries* from a just Authority, and the sinfulness and folly of the *Seſtaries* refusing to submit to it.

The Church of England (as 'tis called) would fain have it thought, That they are Judges in matters Spiritual, yet dare not say positively, there is no Appeal from them.

Is not the Church of England really what it is called? I would fain know what it wants to make it as good a Church, as any in the Christian World? It wants neither *Faith* (if the Creed contain it) nor *Sacraments*, (and those entire) nor *Succession of Bishops*, (as certain as Rome it self) nor a *Liturgy*, (more agreeing to Primitive Worship, than is any where else to be found.) Why then the Church of England; as 'tis called? Well! But what is this Church now blamed for? They pretend to be Judges in matters Spiritual, and yet dare not say there is no appeal from them. How then? Are there no true Judges, but such as there lies no Appeal from? There lies an Appeal from any Judges in the Kings Courts to the Court of Parliament; are They not therefore true Judges in Westminster-Hall? There lay an Appeal from Bishops to Metropolitans, from them to Patriarchs, from Patriarchs to General Councils, according to the Antient Polity of the Church. Were there therefore no true Judges, but General Councils?

What follows relating to the Churches Authority, and every Mems following his own judgment, hath been answered already. I proceed therefore, to what further concerns this matter of Appeal.

What Countrey can subsist in Quiet, where there is not a Supream Judge, from whence there can be no Appeal?

The natural consequence from hence appears to be, That every National Church ought to have the Supream Power within it self. But how come Appeals to a foreign Jurisdiction to tend to the Peace and Quiet of a Church? They have been always complained of in the best Ages of the Church, and by the best Men; such as St. Cyprian, and St. Augustine and the whole African Churches. The worst Men began them, and the worst Church encouraged them, without regard to the Peace of the Christian Church, so it increased its own Grandeur by them.

We have had these hundred Years past, the sad effects of denying to the Church, that Power in matters Spiritual, without an Appeal.

And our Ancestors for many hundred Years last past, found the intolerable Inconveniences of an Appeal to foreign Jurisdiction: Whereby the Nation was exhausted, Justice obstructed, the Clergy oppressed, and the Kings Prerogative greatly diminished. *But these were slight things in Comparison to what we have felt these hundred Years past for want of it.*

Have not the Kings Courts been open for matters of Law and Justice, which have been fill'd with Men of as great Abilities and Integrity, since the Reformation as ever they were before? Hath not the Appeal to the King in his High Court of Chancery been as much for the King & People, as ever the Appeal was to the Court of Rome? Have not all the Neighbour Princes been forced for the preserving their own Dignity to set Bounds and Limits to Appeals to Rome, and to Orders or Bulls that come from thence? How then comes the want of such an Appeal to be thought to produce such sad effects here? All Christendom groans under the sad effects of them: and it is a very self-denying humour for those to be most sensible of the want of them, who would really suffer the most by them.

Can there be any Justice done, where the Offenders are their own Judges, and equal Interpreters of the Law, with those that are appointed to Administer Justice?

And is there any likelihood, Justice should be better done in another Country, by another Authority, and proceeding by such Rules, which in the last resort, are but the Arbitrary will of a Stranger. And must such a one, pretending to a Power he hath no right to, be Judge in his own Cause, when he is the greatest Offender himself? But how is this applied to the Protestants in England?

This is our Case, here in England, in matters Spiritual; for the Protestants are not of the Church of England, as 'tis the true Church, from whence there can be no Appeal; but because the Discipline of that Church is conformable at present to their fancies; which, as soon as it shall contradict or vary from, they are ready to embrace or join with the next Congregation of People, whose Discipline or Worship agrees with the Opinion of that Time.

The sense of this Period is not so clear, but that one may easily mistake about it. That which is aimed at, is, that we of the Church of England, have no tie upon us,
but

but that of our own judgments; and when that changes, we may join with Independents or Presbyterians, as we do now with the Church of England. And what security can be greater, than that of our Judgments? If it be said to be nothing, but *fancy and no true Judgment*, we must beg leave to say, that we dare Appeal to the World, whether we have not made it appear, that it is not *Fancy*, but *Judgment* which hath made us firm to the Church of England. Might it not as well have been said, that the Protestants of the Church of England, adhered to the Crown in the Times of Rebellion out of *Fancy*, and not out of *Judgment*? And that if their *Fancy* changed, they might as well have joined with the Rebels? Will not this way of Reasoning hold as strongly against those of the Church of Rome? For why do any adhere to that, but because it is agreeable to their Judgment so to do? What evidence can they give, that it is *Judgment* in them, and only *Fancy* in us? If Reason must be that which puts the difference, we do not question, but to make ours appear to be *Judgment*, and theirs *Fancy*? For what is an *infallible Judge*, which Christ never appointed, but *Fancy*? What is their *unwritten Word*, as a Rule of Faith to be equally received with the Scriptures, but *Fancy*? What is giving honour to God by the *Worship of Images*, but *Fancy*? What is making *Mediators of Intercession*, besides the *Mediator of Redemption*, but *Fancy*? What is the *Doctrine of Concomitancy*, to make amends for half the Sacrament, but *Fancy*? What is the *substantial Change of the Elements into the Body of Christ*, but *Fancy*? for both Senses and Reason are against it. What is the *deliverance of Souls out of Purgatory, by Masses for the Dead*, but meer *Fancy*? But I forbear giving any more Instances.

So that according to this Doctrine, there is no other Church nor Interpreter of Scripture, but that which lies in every Man's giddy Brain.

Let Mens Brains be as giddy, as they are said to be, for all that I can see, they are the best faculties they can make use of, for the understanding of Scripture, or any thing else. And is there any *Infallible Church* upon Earth, which must not be beholding to Mens *giddy Brains* for believing it? And it may be, never theless giddy for doing it? For God sake why do any Men take the *Church of Rome* to be *Infallible*? Is it not, because their Understandings tell them they ought so to do? So that by this consequence, there is no *Infallible Church*, but what lies in every Mans giddy Brain.

I desire to know therefore of every serious Considerer of these things, whether the great Work of our Salvation ought to depend on such a Sandy Foundation as this?

I thank God I have seriously considered this matter, and must declare that I find no Christian Church built on a more *sandy Foundation*, than that, which pretends

to be settled upon a Rock; I mean, so far as it imposes the *new Faith of Trent*, as a necessary Condition of Salvation. Had we no other reason to embrace Christianity, than such as they offer for these New Doctrines, I am much afraid Christianity it self, to all inquisitive Men, would be thought to have but a *Sandy Foundation*. But what is this *Sandy Foundation* we build upon? Every Man's private judgment in Religion? No understanding Man builds upon his own Judgment, but no Man of understanding can believe without it. For I appeal to any ingenious Man, whether he doth not as much build upon his own Judgment, who chuseth the Church, as he that chuseth Scripture for his Rule? And he that chuseth the Church, hath many more Difficulties to conquer than the other hath. For the Church can never be a Rule without the Scriptures, but the Scriptures may without the Church. And it is no such easy matter to find the Churches Infallibility in the Scripture. But suppose that be found, he hath yet a harder Point to get over, viz. How the Promises relating to the Church in general, came to be appropriated to the Church of Rome. Which a Man must have an admirable Faculty at discerning; who can find it out, either in Scripture, or the Records of the *Ancient Church*.

The places of Scripture which are brought about Christ's being with his Church to the end of the World, about the Power to forgive Sins; about the Clergy being God's Labourers Husbandry, Building, having the Mind of Christ; do as effectually prove Infallibility of the Church of England, as the Church of Rome; for I cannot discern the least inclination in any of them to favour one against the other.

And pray consider on the other side, that those who resist the Truth, and will not submit to his Church, draw their Arguments from Implications, and far-fetched Interpretations, at the same time that they deny plain and positive Words: which is so great a Disingenuity, that 'tis not almost to be thought that they can believe themselves.

This is a very heavy Charge; To resist the Truth, to deny plain and positive Words of Scripture; to be guilty of great Disingenuity, so as not to believe our selves, are faults of so high a nature, as must argue not only a bad Cause, but a very bad Mind. And God forbid, that those of the Church of England, should ever be found guilty of these things. But to come to Particulars; Is it resisting Truth, or arguing from Implications and denying plain and positive Words of Scripture, to say, *We must not worship Images; We must make God alone the Object of Holy Worship; We must give the Eucharist in both kinds according to Christ's express Institution; We must understand our Prayers, when St. Paul's words are so clear about it: So far at least we have plain and positive Words, of Scripture on our side.* And for *Implications, and far-fetched Interpretations* commend me to the Pope's Bulls, especially when they have a mind to prove their Authority from Scripture; which they can do from In the beginning,

to the end of the *Apocalypse*. But that which seems to be aimed at here, is, *This is my Body*; wherein the words seem to be plain and positive on their side, and our sense to be from *Implications, or far fetched Interpretations*. To which I Answer, That there are Expressions in Scripture as plain & positive as this, which none think themselves bound to understand in their literal sense. For then we must all believe, that God hath *Eyes and Ears, a Face, Hands and Feet*, as firmly, as that the Bread was then turned into Christ's Body, when he spake those words. And I would know, whether the Christian Church rejecting the Doctrine of *Those who made God to be like to Man*, was not chargeable with the same *refusing the Truth, and denying plain & positive Words of Scripture* as we are? And yet I hope the Christian Church did then believe it self. Suppose any should assert, *That the Rock in the Wilderness, was really changed into Christ's Body*; would not he have the very same Things to say against those who denied it? For are not the Words as plain and as positive, That Rock was Christ? But *Sacramental Expressions*, by the consent of the *Christian Church*, and the very Nature of the Things, are of a different sense from Logical Propositions. And if this had been intended in the plain and literal sense, *St. Paul* would never have as plainly and positively called it *Bread* after Consecration; nor the *Cup* be said to be the New Testament in his Blood.

The Conclusion is:

Is there any other Foundation of the Protestant Church, but that if the Civil Magistrate pleases, he may call such of the Clergy as he thinks fit for his turn at that time, and turn the Church either to Presbytery, or Independancy, or indeed what he pleases? This was the way of our pretended Reformation here in England. And by the same Rule and Authority, it may be altered into as many Shapes and Forms as there are Fancies in Mens Heads.

This looks like a very unkind Requital to the Church of England, for her Zeal in asserting the Magistrate's Power against a Foreign Jurisdiction; to infer from thence, that the Magistrate may change the Religion here which way he pleases. But altho we attribute the *Supream Jurisdiction* to the King; yet we do not question but there are *inviolable Rights of the Church*, which ought to be preserved against the *Fancies of some*, and the *Usurpations of others*. We do by no means make our Religion mutable, according to the Magistrate's pleasure. For the Rule of our Religion is unalterable, being the *Holy Scripture*; but the Exercise of it is under the regulation of the Laws of the Land. And as we have cause to be thankful to God, when *Kings are Nursing Fathers to our Church*; so we shall never cease to pray for their continuing so; and that in all things we may behave our selves towards the n. as becomes good Christians, and Loyal Subjects

A N

A N
A N S W E R
T O T H E
T H I R D P A P E R.

THE Third Paper is said to be written by a Great Lady, *for the Satisfaction of her Friends*, as to the Reasons of *Her leaving the Communion of the Church of England, and making her self a Member of the Roman Catholick Church.* If she had written nothing concerning it, none could have been a competent Judge of those Reasons or Motives she had for it, but her self: but since she was pleased to write this Paper to satisfy her Friends; and it is thought fit to be published for general Satisfaction, all Readers have a right to judge of the Strength of them; and those of the Church of England, an Obligation to vindicate the Honour of it, so far as it may be thought to suffer by them.

I am sensible how nice and tender a thing it is, to meddle in a Matter wherein the Memory of so Great a Lady is so nearly concern'd; and wherein such Circumstances are mentioned, which cannot fully be cleared, the Parties themselves having been many Years dead: But I shall endeavour to keep within due bounds, and consider this Paper with respect to the main Design of it, and take notice of other Particulars so far as they are subservient to it.

The way of her Satisfaction must needs appear very extraordinary; for towards the Conclusion she confesses, *She was not able, nor would she enter into Disputes with any Body.* Now where the Difference between the two Churches lies wholly in Matters of Dispute, how any one cou'd be truly satisfied, as to the Grounds of leaving one Church, and going to the other, without entering into matters of Dispute with any body, is hard to understand. If Persons be resolv'd before-hand what to do, and therefore will hear nothing said against it, there is

no such way, as to declare they will enter into no Dispute about it. But what Satisfaction is to be had in this manner of proceeding? How could one bred up in the Church of England, and so well instructed in the Doctrines of it, ever satisfy her self in forsaking the Communion of it, without enquiring into, and comparing the Doctrines and Practices of both Churches? It is possible for Persons of Learning, who will take the pains of examining things themselves, to do that, without entering into Disputes with any Body; but this was not to be presumed of a Person of her Condition. For many things must fall in her way, which she could neither have the leisure to examine, nor the Capacity to judge of, without the Assistance of such who made it their business to search into them. Had she no Divines of the Church of England about her; to have propoed her Scruples to? None able and willing to give her their utmost Assistance in a Matter of such Importance, before she took up a Resolution of forsaking our Church? This cannot be imagined; considering not only her great Quality, but that just esteem they had for her whilst she continued so zealous and devout in the Communion of our Church.

But we have more than this to say. One of the Bishops who had nearest Relation to her for many Years, and who owns in Print, *That he bred her up in the Principles of the Church of England*, was both able and willing to have removed any Doubts and Scruples with respect to our Church, if she would have been pleased to have communicated them to him. And however she endeavoured to conceal her Scruples; he tells her, in his Letter to her (which he since printed for his own vindication) *That he had heard much Discourse concerning her wavering in Religion, and that he had acquainted her Highness with it, the Lent before the Date of this Paper*; and was so much concerned at it, that he obtained a Promise from her, *That if any Writing were put into her Hands by those of the Church of Rome, that she would send it either to him, or the then Bishop of Oxford, whom he left in Attendance upon her*. After which, he saith, *She was many Days with him at Farnham; in all which time she spake not one word to him of any Doubt she had about her Religion*. And yet this Paper bears Date, Aug. 20. that Year, wherein she declares her self changed in her Religion: So that it is evident she did not make use of the ordinary Means for her own Satisfaction, at least as to those Bishops who had known her longest.

But she saith, *That she spoke severally to two of the best Bishops we have in England, who both told her, there were many things in the Roman Church, which it were much to be wished we had kept; As Confession, which was no doubt commanded of God; that Pray-*

*Preface to his
Treatise. P. 5.*

*Letter to her
Royal Highness
from the Bp. of
Winton. P.
3, 4.*

Blandford.

Pag. 14.

*Sheldon A. B.
of Canterb.
Blanford Bp.
of Worcester.*

ing for the Dead, was one of the Ancient Things in Christianity; that for their parts they did it daily, though they would not own it. And afterwards, pressing one of them very much upon the other Points; he told her, *That if he had been bred a Catholick, he would not change his Religion; but that being of another Church, wherein he was sure were all things necessary to Salvation, he thought it very ill to give that Scandal, as to leave that Church wherein he received his Baptism. Which Discourses, she said, did but add more to the desire she had to be a Catholick.*

This, I confess, seems to be to the purpose; if there were not some Circumstances and Expressions very much mistaken in the Representation of it: But yet suppose the utmost to be allow'd, there could be no Argument from hence drawn for leaving the Communion of our Church, if this Bishop's Authority or Example did signify any thing with her. For supposing he did say, *That if he had been bred in the Communion of the Church of Rome, he would not change his Religion:* Yet he added, *That being of another Church, wherein were all things necessary to Salvation, he thought it very ill to give that Scandal, as to leave that Church wherein he had received his Baptism.* Now why should not the last words have greater force to have kept her in the Communion of our Church, than the former to have drawn her from it? For why should any Person forsake the Communion of our Church, unless it appears necessary to Salvation so to do? And yet this yielding Bishop did affirm, *that all things necessary to Salvation were certainly in our Church; and that it was an ill thing to leave it.* How could this add to her desire of leaving our Church? unless there were some other Motive to draw her thither, and then such small Inducements would serve to inflame such a Desire. But it is evident from her own words afterwards, that these Concessions of the Bishop could have no Influence upon her: for she declares, *and calls God to witness, that she would never have changed her Religion, if she had thought it possible to save her Soul otherwise.* Now what could the Bishop's words signify towards her Turning, when he declares just contrary, *viz. not only that it was possible for her to be saved without turning, but that he was sure we had all things necessary to Salvation; and that it was a very ill thing to leave our Church?* There must therefore have been some more secret Reason, which increased her Desire to be a Catholick after these Discourses: unless the Advantage were taken from the Bishop's calling the Church of Rome the Catholick Religion; If he had been bred a Catholick, he would not have chang'd his Religion. But if we take these words so strictly, he must have contradicted himself; for how could he be sure we had all things necessary to Salvation, if we were out of the Catholick Church? Was a Bishop of our Church, and one of the best Bishops of our Church, as she said, so weak as to yield, *That he was sure all things necessary to Salvation were to be had out of the Communion of the Catholick Church?*

But

But again, there is an inconsistency in his saying. *That he thought it very ill to leave our Church*; which no Man of common sense would have said, if he had believed the *Roman Church* to be the *Catholic*, exclusive of all others that do not join in Communion with it.

The utmost then that can be made of all this, is, That there was a certain Bishop of this Church, who held both Churches to be so far Parts of the *Catholic Church*, that there was no necessity of going from one Church to another. But if he asserted that, he must overthrow the necessity of the Reformation, and consequently not believe our Articles and Homilies, and so could not be any true Member of the Church of England.

But the late Bishop of Winchester hath made a shorter Answer to all this; For he first doubts, *Whether there ever were any such Bishops who made such Answers*; And afterwards he affirms, *That he believes there never was, in Rerum Naturâ, such a Discourse as is pretended to have been between this Great Person, and two of the most Learned Bishops of England*. But, God be thanked, the Cause of our Church doth not depend upon the singular Opinion of one or two Bishops in it, wherein they apparently recede from the establish'd Doctrine of it. And I am sure those of the Church of Rome take it ill from us, to be charged with the Opinion of Particular Divines, against the known Sentiments of their Church. Therefore supposing the Matter of Fact true, it ought not to have moved her to any Inclination to leave the Church of England.

Preface, p. 2.
p. 4.

But after all, *She protests, in the Presence of Almighty God, that no Person, Man or Woman, directly or indirectly, ever said any thing to her (since she came into England) or used the least Endeavour to make her change her Religion; and that it is a Blessing she wholly owes to Almighty God*. So that the Bishops are acquitted from having any hand in it, by her own words; and as far as we can understand her meaning, she thought her self converted by immediate Divine Illumination. We had thought the pretence to a private Spirit had not been at this time allowed in the Church of Rome. But I observe, that many things are allowed to bring Persons to the Church of Rome, which they will not permit in those who go from it. As the use of Reason in the Choice of a Church; the Judgment of Sense; and here, that which they would severely condemn in others as a Private Spirit, or *Enthusiasm*, will pass well enough if it doth but lead one to their Communion. Any Motive or Method is good enough which tends to that end; and none can be sufficient against it. But why may not others set up for the Change as to other Opinions upon the same Grounds, as well as this Great Person does, as to the Change from our Church to the Church of Rome? And we have no Pretenders to *Enthusiasm* among us; but do as solemnly ascribe the Blessing wholly to Almighty God; and look on it as the Effect of such Prayers as she made to him, in France and Flanders.

But I wonder a Person, who owed her Change so wholly to Almighty God, should need the Direction of an Infallible Church; since the utmost they can pretend to, is no more than to have such an Immediate Conduct; and the least that can be meant by it, is, that she had no Assistance from any other Persons. Which may not exclude her own Endeavours: but supposing them to be employed, and an Account to be here given of them: yet there is no Connexion between any of the Premises, and the Conclusion she drew from them; and therefore it must be Immediate Impulse, or some concealed Motive which determin'd her Choice.

The Conclusion was, That *she would never have changed, if she could have saved her Soul otherwise.* If this were true, she had good Reason for her Change; if it were not true, she had none; as it is most certain it was not. Now let us examine how she came to this Conclusion; and I will suppose it to have been just in the Method she sets it down in.

First, she saith, *She never had any Scruples till the November before; and then they began upon reading Dr. Heylin's History of the Reformation; which was commended to her as a Book to settle her; and there she found such abominable Sacriledg upon Henry the 8th's Divorce, King Edward's Minority, and Queen Elizabeth's Succession, that she could not believe the Holy Ghost could ever be in such Counsels.*

This was none of the best Advices given to such a Person, to read Dr. Heylin's History for her Satisfaction. For there are two distinct Parts in the History of our Reformation: the one Ecclesiastical, the other Political: the former was built on Scripture and Antiquity, and the Rights of particular Churches; the other on such Maxims which are common to States-men at all Times, and in all Churches, who labour to turn all Revolutions and Charges to their own Advantage. And it is strange to me that a Person of so great Understanding, should not distinguish these two. Whether Henry the 8th were a good Man or not; Whether the Duke of Somerset raised his Estate out of the Church Lands, doth not concern our present Enquiry; which is, Whether there was not sufficient Cause for a Reformation in the Church? And if there was, Whether our Church had not sufficient Authority to reform it self? And if so, Whether the Proceedings of our Reformation were not justifiable by the Rules of Scripture and the Ancient Church? These were the proper Points for her to have considered, and not the particular Faults of Princes, or the Mercenaries of Ministers of State. Were not the Vices of Alexander the 6th and many other Heads of the Church of Rome for a whole Age together, by the Confession of their own greatest Writers, as great at least as the *sc* of Henry the 8th? And were these not thought sufficient to keep her from the Church of Rome; and yet the others were sufficient to make her think of leaving our Church? But Henry the 8th's Church was in Truth the Church of Rome under a Political Head, much as the Church of Sicily is under the King of Spain. All the difference is, Henry
the

the 8th took it as his own Right; the King of Spain pretends to have it from the Pope, by such Concessions, which the Popes deny. And suppose the King of Spain's Pretence were unlawful to that Jurisdiction which he challengeth in the Kingdom of Sicily; were this a sufficient Ground to justify the thoughts of Separation from the Church of Rome?

But the Duke of Somerset raised his Estate out of Church-Lands, and so did many Courtiers in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.

Are there not Miscarriages of the like nature in the Church of Rome? What is the Popes making great Estates out of the Church-Lands, for their Nephews to be Princes and Dukes? a thing not unheard of in our Age. And is it not so much worse to be done by the Head of the Church?

These she confesses were but *Scruples*; but such as occasioned her examining the Points in difference by the Holy Scripture. Now she was in the right way for Satisfaction, provided she made use of the best Helps and Means for understanding it; and took in the Assistance of her Spiritual Guides. But it seems, contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, she found some things so easy there, that she wondered she had been so long without finding them out. And what were these? No less than the Real Presence in the blessed Sacrament; the Infallibility of the Church, Confession, and Praying for the Dead.

These were great Discoveries to be made so easily, considering how those of the Church of Rome, who have been most vers'd in these Matters, have found it so difficult to make them out from thence.

(1.) As to the *Real Presence*; as it is in the Dispute between us and the Church of Rome, it implies the Real and Substantial Change of the Elements into the Body and Blood of Christ. But where do our Saviour's words, in calling the Sacrament his Body and Blood, imply any such thing? The wisest Persons of the Church of Rome have confessed, that the bare words of our Saviour can never prove it; but there needs the Authority of the Church to interpret them in that sense. How then could she so easily find out that, which their most Learned Men could not? But there is nothing goes so far in such Discoveries as a willing Mind.

(2.) As to *Confession*. No doubt the Word is often used in Scripture, and therefore easily found. But the Question between us, is not about the Usefulness or Advantage of Confession in particular Cases, but the Necessity of it in all Cases, in order to Remission of Sins. And I can hardly believe any Bishop of our Church would ever say to her, that Confession in this sense was ever commanded by God. For then he must be damned himself if he did not confess every known Sin to a Priest. But some general Expressions might be used, that Confession of Sin was commanded by God; *Confess your Sins one to another*: But here is nothing of a particular Confession to a Priest, necessary in order to Forgiveness of Sin.

(3.) As

(3.) *As to praying for the Dead*; It is hard to find any place of Scripture which seems to have any tendency that way, unless it be with respect to the *Day of Judgment*, and that very doubtfully. But how came this Great Person to think it not possible to be saved in our Church, unless we prayed for the Dead? How did this come to be a Point of Salvation? And for the Practice of it, she saith, the Bishops told her they did it daily. Whether they did it or not, or in what sense they did it, we cannot now be better informed. But we are sure this could be no Argument for her to leave the Communion of our Church, because she was told by these Bishops they did it, and continued in the Communion of it.

(4.) *Lastly*; *As to the Infallibility of the Church*. If this, as applied to the *Roman Church*, could be any where found in Scripture, we should then indeed be to blame not to submit to all the Definitions of it. But where is this to be found? Yes, *Christ hath promised to be with his Church to the end of the World*. Not with his Church, but with his Apostles: And if it be restrained to them, then the end of the World is no more than always. But suppose it be understood of the Successors of the Apostles; were there none but at *Rome*? How comes this Promise to be limited to the Church of *Rome*; and the Bishops of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, and all the other Eastern Churches (where the Bishops as certainly succeeded the Apostles, as at *Rome* it self) not to enjoy the equal Benefit of this Promise? But they who can find the *Infallibility of the Church of Rome* in Scripture, need not despair of finding whatever they have a Mind to there.

But from this Promise she concludes, *That our Saviour would not permit the Church to give the Laity the Communion in One kind, if it were not lawfull so to do*. Now in my Opinion, the Argument is stronger the other way; The Church of *Rome* forbids the doing of that, which Christ enjoyed; therefore it cannot be Infallible, since the Command of Christ is so much plainer than the Promise of Infallibility to the Church of *Rome*.

But, from all these things laid together, I can see no imaginable Reason of any force to conclude, that she could not think it possible to save her Soul otherwise, than by embracing the Communion of the Church of *Rome*. And the Publick will receive this Advantage by these Papers, that thereby it appears, how very little is to be said by Persons of the greatest Capacity, as well as Place, either against the Church of *England*, or for the Church of *Rome*.

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

Page 3. line 10. for *fiking*, read *sinking*.

Books Printed for and Sold by *Robert Thornton*,
Bookseller, at the Sign of the Leather-Bottle, in
Skinner-Row.

Copies of Two Papers written by the Late King *Charles* the Second of Blessed Memory, and Published by Command of his present Majesty.--- Together with an Answer to the said Papers.

An Abridgment of the English Military Discipline, Printed by His present Majesties Especial Command for the use of the Forces throughout His Dominions.

A Papist Misrepresented and Represented: or, a twofold Character of Popery. The one Containing a Sum of the Superstitions, Idolatries, Cruelties, Treacheries, and wicked Principles of that Popery which hath disturb'd this Nation above an hundred and fifty Years; fill'd it with Fears and Jealousies, and deserves the Hatred of all good Christians. The other laying open that Popery which the Papists own and profess; with the chief Articles of their Faith, and some of the Principal Grounds and Reasons, which hold them in that Religion. By *J. L.* one of the *Church of Rome*: To which is added, A Book Entitled, *The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome*, truly Represented: In Answer to the aforesaid Book. By a *Protestant of the Church of England*.

An Antidote against Popery, Shewing how a devout Soul in the midst of the manifold distractions and divisions about Religion, and Pretensions, and Claims to the Church, may, against all Scruples, rest satisfied, and settled in mind, and chearfully go on in Gods Service, to Salvation. By a Reverend Divine of the *Church of England*.

Officium Eucharisticum, or a Preparatory Service to a devout and worthy Reception of the Lords Supper; to which is added a Meditation for every day in the Week.

The Fundamentals of the Protestant Religion asserted by Reason, as well as Scripture, written in French, by the Famous *Monsieur de Gombaud*; and Translated into English by *Sidney Lodge, &c.*

(3.) As to *praying for the Dead*; It is hard to find any place of Scripture which seems to have any tendency that way, unless it be with respect to the *Day of Judgment*, and that very doubtfully. But we came this Great Person to think it not possible to be saved in our Church, unless we prayed for the Dead? How did this come to be a Point of Salvation? And for the *Practice* of it, she saith, the Bishops told her they did it daily. Whether they did it or not, or in what sense they did it, we cannot now be better informed. But we are sure this could be no Argument for her to leave the Communion of our Church, because she was told by these Bishops they did it, and continued in the Communion of it.

(4.) Lastly; As to the *Infallibility of the Church*. If this, as applied to the *Roman Church*, could be any where found in Scripture, we should then indeed be to blame not to submit to all the Definitions of it. But where is this to be found? Yes, *Christ hath promised to be with his Church to the end of the World*. Not with his Church, but with his *Apostles*: And if it be restrained to them, then the end of the World is no more than *always*. But suppose it be understood of the Successors of the Apostles; were there none but at Rome? How comes this Promise to be limited to the Church of Rome; and the Bishops of Antioch and Alexandria, and all the other Eastern Churches (where the Bishops as certainly succeeded the Apostles, as at Rome it self) not to enjoy the equal Benefit of this Promise? But they who can find the *Infallibility of the Church of Rome* in Scripture, need not despair of finding whatever they have a Mind to there.

But from this Promise she concludes, *That our Saviour would not permit the Church to give the Laity the Communion in One kind, if it were not lawfull so to do*. Now in my Opinion, the Argument is stronger the other way; The Church of Rome forbids the doing of that, which Christ enjoyed; therefore it cannot be Infallible, since the Command of Christ is so much plainer than the Promise of Infallibility to the Church of Rome.

But, from all these things laid together, I can see no imaginable Reason of any force to conclude, that she could not think it possible to save her sent otherwise, than by embracing the Communion of the Church of Rome. And the Publick will receive this Advantage by these Papers, that thereby it appears, how very little is to be said by Persons of the greatest Capacity, as well as Place, either against the Church of England, or for the Church of Rome.

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

